

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and continued prosecution of this application in view of the following remarks.

1. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 13, 17, 18, 19 and 20 were amended to further clarify the invention. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as originally filed, for example in Figures 1-2.

2. 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-5 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,817,588 to Bledsoe (Bledsoe). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Bledsoe discloses a knee brace having a hinge on both sides of the knee brace. It does not disclose a knee brace having a single hinge side on the knee brace.

3. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

**a. Bledsoe, In View Of Davis, Does Not Teach Or Suggest A
Knee Brace Of The Present Invention**

Claims 6-10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bledsoe in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,421,810 to Davis et al. (Davis). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Davis teaches a hip brace comprising a pivot joint having intermeshing teeth. However, neither Davis nor Bledsoe teach or suggest a knee brace having a single hinge side. Davis only teaches a hip brace and does not teach a knee brace. Bledsoe does not teach a knee brace having a single hinge side. The knee brace of Bledsoe has two hinges on opposite sides of the brace, and therefore has two hinge sides rather than a single hinge side. This differs greatly from the present invention which has a single hinge side.

**b. Bledsoe, In View Of Airy, Does Not Teach Or Suggest A
Knee Brace Of The Present Invention**

Claims 11-14 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bledsoe in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,052,379 to Airy et al. (Airy). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Airy teaches a knee brace comprising an adjustable cuff. However, neither Airy nor Bledsoe teach or suggest a knee brace having a single hinge side. Both Airy and Bledsoe only teach a knee brace having two hinges on opposite sides of the brace, and therefore having two hinge sides rather than a single hinge side. This differs greatly from the present invention which has a single hinge side.

**c. Bledsoe, In View Of Castillo, Does Not Teach Or Suggest A
Knee Brace Of The Present Invention**


Claims 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bledsoe in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,135,469 to Castillo (Castillo). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Castillo discloses a knee brace comprising a foam rubber skin adhesion layer including a silicone material. However, neither Castillo nor Bledsoe teach or suggest a knee brace having a single hinge side. Both Castillo and Bledsoe only disclose a knee brace having two hinges on opposite sides of the knee brace, having two hinge sides. This differs greatly from the present invention which has a single hinge side.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-34 are in condition for allowance. An early indication of allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James D. Ryndak
Reg. No. 28,754
Attorney for Applicants

Date: 8/6/2007

RYNDAK & SURI LLP
200 W. Madison Street, Suite 2100
Chicago, IL 60606
312-214-7770 (telephone)
312-214-7715 (facsimile)

Appl. No. 10/609,986
Attorney Docket No. 26111-10281